20¢ SEPTEMBER 18, 1950

New Republic

NEXT STEPS FOR THE WEST

By MICHAEL STRAIGHT

THE ATOM IN PEACE AND WAR

By LEON SVIRSKY

THE ASSEMBLY TAKES OVER

AN EDITORIAL

HAROLD L. ICKES ON: "GIMME $60 MILLION"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHICH POLITICAL PARTY HAS LED THE DRIVE TO HALT COMMUNISM IN THE US?

Do Democrats or Republicans lead in the number of votes cast in support of Anti-Communist measures? What are the startling facts revealed in a survey recently compiled by a special Senatorial committee and as yet unreleased to the public?

(For answer, see page 9 in the September 4th issue of the NEW REPUBLIC)

WHAT IS THE REAL CONDITION OF WESTERN EUROPE'S DEFENSE SYSTEM?

Just how capable are the present Allied occupying forces of withstanding an invasion of Western Europe? Must we rearm Germany in an effort to fortify Europe against a possible all-out "hot" war?

(For answer, see page 14 in the August 28th issue of the NEW REPUBLIC)

If you are a regular reader of the NEW REPUBLIC, you know the answers to these and other critical questions which vitally affect your welfare and your way of life. If not, you'll want to use the coupon below to make certain you don't miss a single issue!

HOW DOES US STEEL'S CONTROL OF THE INDUSTRY AFFECT OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY?

Does the giant size of this corporation reflect its superiority in an openly competitive market? More important, does its ever-expanding control promote the public welfare? And why were the newspapers so reluctant to give more than haphazard coverage to the vital facts about US Steel uncovered during the recent House subcommittee investigation?

(For answer, see page 12 in the August 21st issue of the NEW REPUBLIC)

WHY ARE OUR STOCKPILES OF CRITICAL MATERIALS SO LOW?

Is it due to negligence on the part of the Administration? To the fact that some materials are extremely scarce and can't be had at any price? Or is there another, more sinister reason for the present shortage of vital supplies?

(For answer, see page 3 in the September 4th issue of the NEW REPUBLIC)

Armed Service Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $4.00 please enter an annual subscription in my name at the special Armed Service rate of $4.00.

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

IN FULL_____ 9/18/50

Regular Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $6.50 please enter an annual subscription in my name. (Foreign or Canadian postage $1.00 extra.)

NAME_____

STREET_____

CITY_____

ZONE_____ STATE_____ 9/18/50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR SEPT. 18, 1950

5 The Assembly Takes Over: An Editorial
6 The Week:
6 Mobilization Is Too Slow
6 The Fight Goes On
7 Full of Loopholes
7 The Big Lie in Washington
7 Truman Against Franco
8 Witch-Hunting in Excelsis
8 The Folly of Compromise
8 Herblock Cartoon
9 Outside America
10 Empire State Politics By Robert Spivack
11 The Atom in Peace and War By Leon Svirsky
14 Next Steps for the West By Michael Straight
17 Harold L. Ickes
18 Books:
18 E. E. Cummings and Alfred Hayes, by M. L. Rosenthal
19 Law and Ethics By Jacob D. Hyman
20 "Across the River and Into the Trees" Reviewed by Kate Simon
21 Brief Comment
21 Theatre
22 Music

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

FOREIGN AFFAIRS EDITOR: Percy Winner

WASHINGTON BUREAU: Helen Fuller (Political Editor), Jean Begeman

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY EDITING: Elizabeth Huling (Chief), Ruth Tarcov

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1950, IN THE U. S. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY 20¢, YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

SLOWLY, CREEPINGLY, the effects of the Lukewarm War shift our lives. Few have the courage to face obvious facts. Warnings of "sacrifices" ahead still seem rhetorical. So-called "restrictions" such as limiting time payments on autos to 21 months are laughably mild. But this is just the start. The glacial forward movement is now implacable. This reporter has talked to high officials in different government branches—calm, moderate, superbly-informed men. They still believe hot war can be avoided. But the changes coming now, they believe, may last our lifetime. Goodbye, old world.

Take defense. Before going to the New York Foreign Ministers' conference, Acheson termed the affair the most important Big Three meeting since World War II. He took with him a decision to back integration of West European troops into one unified force which would incorporate West German divisions. Over-all command would be vested in a single Allied staff and more American divisions would go to Europe. The trend is to a bigger and bigger standing army; ultimately, probably universal service.

Take economic controls. Truman outlined some last Saturday. This is just the beginning. Almost certainly Congress won't impose enough taxes to stop inflation. An elaborate confidential staff analysis by the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report shows a minimum of $9 billion of new taxes needed immediately (including an excess-profits tax), whereas the Senate bill carries only half that. Congress won't tax enough; *ergo*, more inflation. That means more and sharper controls later on. If you want to use adjectives, it is, of course, shameful that Congress doesn't halt inflation dead in its tracks, now when it can, because it will be so much harder later. But that is the way our government operates. We won't bore you by pointing out that the conservative "sound-money" men—the Byrds, Georges, Millikins—are clinging to halfway measures now.

Most Washington politicians think Dewey will be reëlected Governor of New York, though Lynch may "do a Truman" and surprise everyone. Dewey's victory couldn't be welcome to Bob Taft. Dewey has been in the internationalist, Taft the isolationist, wing of the GOP. If both men come through their 1950 election battles they will be in opposite corners again in 1952. People who saw Tom Dewey stay till the last lonely politician left a Gridiron Club dinner here recently, believe he still has Presidential aspirations. Controlling New York's GOP delegation, Dewey could just about veto Taft's nomination.

Censorship by self-appointed loyalty groups is nothing new, but the groveling willingness of press and radio to cringe before them is an alarming symptom. Following the Jean Muir case in New York, theatrical workers are uniting to defend themselves against what could easily be blackmail. Cabinet members need a protective association, too. Interior Secretary Oscar Chapman did a swell job defending himself against the latest smear campaign directed against a Cabinet member. For two years nobody had heard of Kansas GOP Senator Schoeppel. Suddenly, under cover of Congressional immunity, he rose on the Senate floor and began throwing gutter-charges of "pro-Communism" against Chapman which even fellow Republicans repudiated. Reporters decided that they preferred McCarthy to Schoeppel; at least the former wasn't sanctimonious.

Democrats also thought they had got a break from charges by Senator Bridges (R, N. H.) that the National Farmers' Union is "Communist-infiltrated." Republican Senators Langer, Mundt and Young instantly denied the charge and recoiled in horror at the attack on the powerful political group. Bridges, you remember, is the Senator who secretly got $35,000 as co-trustee of the John L. Lewis welfare fund. He has now put up J. Wesley Powell, his former adminis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trative assistant, to try to knock off liberal Senator Tobey in the New Hampshire primary.

Marriner Eccles, honest, hard-hitting former head of the Reserve Board, demoted by Truman, planned to quit the Board this month but has postponed it to the first of the year. The Board is engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the Treasury. The Board wants higher interest rates to curb inflation; the Treasury wants low interest rates to make government financing cheaper. Involved in this struggle to defend the dollar is the secondary issue of the independence of the Board. Congress created the Board (America's central bank) to be independent, like a court of law. If it loses this battle, which is rocking the financial world, it becomes merely an administrative agency of the Treasury.

The President blundered in losing his temper and attacking the Marine Corps lobby. But his apology and subsequent appearance before their convention here were typical. Truman may not be a great figure, but he is a human one. The man in the street loses his temper, too, and can understand Truman. The Marines warmly applauded the visitor. Final score: Marines 1; Truman 1.

Truman has had three recent brushes with super-patriot Senator Pat McCarran (D, Nev.). McCarran wrote a violent anti-Communist rider into the bill designed to naturalize 88,000 US-domiciled Japanese; Truman vetoed it. McCarran bludgeoned Congress into the Franco loan under threat of Catholic political retaliation; Truman shelved the loan. McCarran is now pushing an extremist anti-subversion bill; Truman says he will veto it.

Notes. The chief question left by the Schoeppel dud is, who planted it? . . . The AFL's usually dull two-week convention has been streamlined into one week, opening at Houston on September 18 and featuring vital issues of labor unity, economic controls and the proposed no-strike pledge. . . . Homesick Congress is still stalled in Washington. . . . Dictatorial John L. Lewis' welfare fund faces court investigation.

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

An Exercise in Logic

SIR: I quote from the article "India and Peace in Asia," which appeared in your issue of August 28:

> Just as diplomatic recognition of one government by another should carry no moral implication whatever of approval or disapproval, but should be based solely on whether it is in possession of the territory and willing and able to meet its obligations, so membership in the UN should rest similarly on the facts of the case.

With this proposition I agree, and admit that it does in fact apply to the Communist government of China.

There is, however, a problem. It seems to me that Dictator Franco's regime in Spain satisfies the above-mentioned criteria . . . at least as well as does Communist China. Yet the very people who most frequently use the above argument in urging recognition of China are the ones who cry out most violently against recognizing Spain. And emotionally I am inclined to agree with them. But the question is: How can the discrimination between the two countries when applying the above test be explained without violating the rules of logic? Perhaps another reader can cut this knot.

Trenton, N. J. J. JOSEPH HUTHMACHER

The New Equality

SIR: In your insistence on non-segregation and racial equality you continually overlook the rights of the millions of white people in the South and elsewhere who do not want it. What about these white people? By your logic the white people should have no voice in the matter. They should have equality forced on them by law. . . .

Not only whites but Negroes themselves don't intend to be forced to live and associate with people with whom they don't want to live and associate. Their idea of freedom and democracy includes the right to segregate as they damn well please. . . . In not being sensible, in not being factual and honest about this, in not admitting that people have a right to segregate if they want to, the *New Republic* and its Manhattan specialists on life in the South are not only proving themselves dishonest and strongly biased, but they are also distracting from the effect the magazine might have in other important respects. Considering how you view the race question, most people can have little confidence in your integrity on other matters.

THOMAS M. EDMUNDSON

Los Angeles, Calif.

[By the logic of Mr. Edmundson's first paragraph, the enthusiasm shown by the residents of a red-light district for the institution of prostitution should render the practice immune from police suppression. In a contest between the conscience of the nation and the prejudices of a regional group, we find ourselves allied with the larger body. We do, however, stand firmly with Mr. Edmundson on the principle of self-segregation. Any Negro who finds the company of whites offensive to him has our sympathy; but we must in honesty report that we receive singularly few complaints on this score. – THE EDITORS]

Blind Spot

SIR: Max Lerner's excellent review of my book, *In Search* (the *NR*, July 24), erred on one point. This was the implication that many publishers rejected the book for fear of libel suits. There is no libel in *In Search*. During the course of a year it was rejected by ten publishers. One stated that it was "too much on the Jewish theme"—and asked me to turn it into a novel! Another informed my agent that I "blamed everything on being a Jew." A third said it was disorganized and lacked "general appeal." Others were less specific. Several, in rejecting it, said it contained my best writing.

After the tough time I had getting through this blind area in the publishing world, I may perhaps be permitted to indulge myself in a quotation from a reader—for *In Search* has already brought me more reader mail than all my previous books together. This is from Stephen Miller, of San Francisco: "I have never been as moved by anything I have ever read. It cleared my mind from its fuzzy thinking. I know now I can be a good American, a good Jew."

New York City MEYER LEVIN

Pseudo-therapy

SIR: Dr. Martin Gumpert's comments on dianetics (the *NR*, August 14) called forth a long "Amen" from me. . . . I wish there were an easy way to help people as Hubbard suggests, but my experience as a family caseworker does not justify such a hope. The idea that you can remember pre-natal experiences is sheer fantasy; it is pretty difficult for clients to remember anything before they learned to talk. I think it is logical to assume that real memories do require some vehicle such as verbalization; Freud was content to carry his patients back to the second and third year. . . .

A person sick emotionally should seek a person who has deliberately prepared himself to help him and has had enough experience with his method to know what he is about. Most family-counseling agencies are equipped with a psychiatric consultant and offer free services. . . . We would like to see people before they get loused up with any such pseudo-therapist as a dianetician.

Seattle, Wash. PATRICIA HOWELL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 123, NUMBER 12, ISSUE 1868, NEW YORK CITY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1950 **New Republic**

THE ASSEMBLY TAKES OVER

THE WORLD CENTER of political gravity now swings away from the Security Council of the UN, which since August 1 has been used largely as an instrument of Russian and Communist propaganda. The Foreign Ministers of the Big Three nations are meeting this week in New York; then comes the conference of the Foreign Ministers of the North Atlantic Council; and on September 19 begins the meeting of the General Assembly. Quite possibly before that session is ended momentous issues may have been decided.

Why this is so is a matter arising from the structure of the UN itself. The Security Council was a misbegotten device growing out of the Second World War, to persuade the victorious Allies to accept the fairly minor surrender of national sovereignty which the UN represented. Five permanent seats are held by the Big Five—the United States, Great Britain, France, Russia and China—and as everyone knows, any one of these powers can exercise a veto on any proposed action of substantial importance. There are six other elective seats, which are rotated among the remaining 54 nations in the UN.

The Assembly, on the contrary, is a meeting of all 59 members; one country, one vote. On routine questions a simple majority of the member nations "present and voting" is sufficient for adoption of any proposal. On questions of major importance, a two-thirds vote is required.

In theory, the Assembly has less power than the Security Council; the Council can order actions taken, while the Assembly can only recommend. But this distinction tends to disappear with the passage of time, just as the importance of the Council vis-à-vis the Assembly is dwindling. No nation in the UN would take action to which its people and government strongly objected, merely because it had been ordered to do so by the Council. In cold fact, a request from the Assembly has as much—and as little—effect as an order from the Security Council.

Russian obstructionism since the beginning of the Korean conflict has brought a sudden and vivid realization of the dangers inherent in depending upon the Security Council for immediate action in an emergency. Looking back, we can see that it was a piece of great good fortune that the Russians were still taking a walk when the fighting started and the UN passed its resolutions of June 25 and 27. The delegates from the free world feel strongly that this risk must not be incurred again. The obvious answer is to turn to the Assembly as a substitute for the Council in every crisis. Students of the Charter now believe that no changes in the document or in the rules of procedure are needed to bring this about. The member nations have representatives in the US, in New York or Washington, who could be summoned on a few hours' notice to an emergency meeting. The Assembly can take up any subject its members wish to discuss. The Security Council can also refer to it any pending matter, and since this would be a procedural action and not a substantive one, it is the present belief that this can be done by a majority of seven of the 11 members and that the veto does not apply, despite Malik's insistence to the contrary.

Regardless of Russia's wishes, every major controversy will be discussed sooner or later at the forthcoming meeting of the Assembly. (Some delegates favor postponing Korea until after the New Year, in the belief that the UN forces will have won a victory in the field by that time.) A report of the Security Council to the Assembly, which will include Korea, is high on the agenda. The subject comes up again under Item 24, "The Problem of the Independence of Korea," the report of the still functioning UN commission on that country.

One aspect of the Korean struggle which is certain to be discussed is whether the fighting should stop at the 38th Parallel. The UN is committed by its original resolution, under which its commission was originally sent to Korea, to free elections to be held throughout the country looking toward a single democratic government for the nation as a whole. It is most unlikely that the Assembly would now modify these terms to the advantage of the Communists; and the presumption is therefore strongly in favor of continuing the fight until the North Koreans lay down their arms or until the UN troops have occupied the whole country.

Formosa, also, will come before the Assembly, since it is similarly discussed in the report of the Security Council. There is a pending resolution of the Chinese Nationalists complaining of aggression by the USSR, Item 23, which will include Formosa. There is also the charge of American aggression, made by the Communists; US delegate Warren Austin has invited a UN in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vestigation of this charge, and the Assembly seems certain to act.

Presumably both Korea and Formosa will be considered matters of major importance, which require a two-thirds vote in the Assembly. Eliminating fractions, this means 40 of the 59 members. The Communist bloc consists of five nations—the USSR, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Byelorussia and the Ukraine; two other countries, Yugoslavia and Egypt, have been abstaining in recent votes in the Security Council. On matters involving Korea, there is no possible doubt of a safe two-thirds majority for the US-UN position. But on Formosa, and on Indo-China, if that question should arise, the situation is less clear.

India, for example, today has the moral leadership of all Asia. Nehru and his government are thoroughly unhappy about Formosa. In common with a number of other countries, they have recognized the Chinese Communists; India is the spearhead of opposition to any continuance of white imperialism in Asia. It is easy to run down the list of UN members and check those which might well be disturbed by the American policy: Afghanistan, Burma, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi-Arabia, Thailand, Turkey, to say nothing of the European and South American countries which have no special love for the US.

The Assembly margin in our favor, if it exists at all, is too slender for comfort. There is all the more reason, therefore, for us to abandon our unilateral activities in every part of Asia; to become in reality, and not merely by lip service, the servant of the UN; to live up to President Truman's fine statement of September 1 that "we do not want Formosa or any part of Asia for ourselves. We believe that the future of Formosa . . . should be settled by international action, and not by the decision of the United States or any other state alone. . . . We believe in the United Nations."

THE WEEK

MOBILIZATION IS TOO SLOW

The beginning that has been made toward economic mobilization under the defense-production act is directed toward the proper goals but may be dangerously slow in timing.

The President has told the nation that we must produce more than ever before, that we must pay for our defense as we go, and that we must prevent inflation. To achieve this, he wisely emphasizes what we must do "to expand our total production . . . develop new techniques and increase efficiency in every way possible." This means "enlarging our capacity to produce basic materials such as steel, aluminum and copper." The President goes so far as to say that the seemingly ambitious goal he set last year of a $300 billion level of production by 1954 is already outdated and that we are capable of going far beyond that figure. Truman's chief economic adviser, Leon Keyserling, had already indicated that a $350 billion economy has become a practical possibility in the immediate future.

A serious government program to expand production all along the line will be developed under the defense-production act. Meanwhile, available supplies will have to be carefully channeled to meet defense needs. However, the Administration is determined to try voluntary methods of allocating supplies between civilian and military industry before turning to government controls to do this job. If the voluntary method fails again as it has in the past, precious materials will have been permanently lost in non-essential products. The President's executive order setting the production act in operation does provide one safeguard. He has established a defense mobilization agency to plan ahead and to integrate the various parts of the voluntary programs, beginning now. If the proper men are placed in key positions in the new agency, the President can be quickly advised when more stringent measures are required. The danger is that those who are given this new responsibility may lack either the background or the courage to sound the alarm in time to put out the fire.

In his talk to the nation on economic controls and inflation, President Truman finally spoke out with some realism on the subject of taxes. For the first time, he called for an excess-profits tax "as soon as possible." Our defense expenditures will be at least double next year—increasing from the present $15 billion level to $30 billion or more. However, in response to the President's call for "fair and just taxes," Senator Walter George, chairman of the Finance Committee, told the press that another $7 billion was about what he had in mind for next year—perhaps $4 billion to come from excess profits and $3 billion from a hike in excise taxes and levies on general income. Obviously, Senator George's plan would fall far short of the "pay-as-we-go" goal held up by Truman. And equally obviously, so soft an approach to taxation would advance, rather than prevent, inflation.

The conservative and gradual approach to economic mobilization which President Truman has chosen is highly risky. Shortages and inflation will be constant dangers. The three men to be selected by the President as joint heads of the new stabilization agency will have to be able to read the economic indicators for signs of trouble and know what to do when they appear.

THE FIGHT GOES ON

The University of Virginia, founded by Thomas Jefferson, will admit its first Negro student this fall. Virginia's historic segregated-education barrier was lifted by a three-judge Federal Court which ordered the University to admit qualified Negroes to its graduate school of law. Judges John J. Parker, Morris A. Soper and John Paul granted the injunction after a 30-minute hearing.

Gregory Swanson, a practising attorney of Martinsville, Virginia, was denied admission to the University last

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

July because he is a Negro. At that time, the Attorney General of Virginia, J. Lindsay Almond Jr., advised the Board of Visitors that if Swanson chose to contest refusal of his admission the University would be unable to defend itself, in view of the recent Supreme Court decision. The Court decreed that Swanson "or any other Negro similarly situated" could not be denied admission "because of his or their race or color, to the Department of Law" under rights secured by the Fourteenth Amendment to the US Constitution.

In North Carolina, meanwhile, Judge Johnson J. Hayes, of the US District Court for the Middle District of that state, is studying a similar case of 10 Negro students seeking admission to the law school of the University of North Carolina. Dean Erwin Griswold of the Harvard University School of Law, testifying for the plaintiffs, told the court that he had personally examined the facilities at North Carolina College for Negroes and found them grossly inferior to those of the State University. Judge Hayes has instructed each side to prepare for him proposed findings of fact and conclusions to be cited when he hands down his decision.

FULL OF LOOPHOLES

The corporation-minded chairmen of the House and Senate tax-writing committees have framed a new revenue bill which has been described in the Senate as opening more loopholes than it closes.

Last January President Truman requested Congress to reduce excise taxes and eliminate weaknesses that permit the use of brazen dodges by wealthy taxpayers. One month after the Korean war began, he sent another message asking that additional funds be raised by retaining most of the excise taxes and increasing the tax rates both on individuals and on corporations. He again emphasized the need for closing the loopholes. Apparently, however, he yielded to what he considered political necessity and agreed to postpone an excess-profits tax to next year, with a vague indication that it might be made retroactive for a few months. When Senator Tom Connally (D, Tex.) insisted on a roll call, there were 36 votes for taxing excess profits now, 42 against it. Twenty-one Democrats, all but four of them from the South, stood with 21 Republicans against the tax; 26 Democrats and 10 Republicans voted for it.

The tax bill, as it nears final form, also contains at least a dozen loopholes, some of them newly created this year, which will cost the government more than half a billion in annual revenue. Some of them:

¶ The Senate killed a House provision for withholding taxes on dividends. Of the $8 billion paid out in corporation dividends annually, $1 billion is not reported on tax returns, and costs the government $160-$170 million a year.

¶ The excessive depletion allowances for land containing oil, gas and minerals, which have cost the government $400 million in the past, will actually be broadened.

¶ Oil operators, now taxed 50 percent or more on their royalties, would pay only the capital-gains rate of 25 percent under the new bill.

¶ Family partnerships to allow businessmen to split their income with their wives, children and other relatives would be legalized.

¶ Corporation executives would be allowed to take part of their salaries in options on company stock to be taxed at the lower capital-gains instead of the normal tax rate.

¶ Life-insurance companies which, through a technical error, have paid no income taxes since 1946, would be given a $50 million present through a provision forgiving them all back taxes except those for the year 1949.

CIO President Philip Murray would seem justified in saying that this interim tax bill "is one of the most brazen examples of special-interest legislation to come before Congress in many years. . . . The bill is an affront to the people of the United States and a disservice to the cause of national unity at a time when our fighting men are engaged with the enemy."

THE BIG LIE IN WASHINGTON

The Republican Party, in a desperate attempt to gain control of the Senate and House in the November elections, has begun a systematic drive to smear each member of the Truman Cabinet. Senator McCarthy's (Wis.) attack on Secretary Acheson and the State Department was followed last week by vicious, and equally false, charges of Communist association against Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman and Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan. Senator Andrew F. Schoeppel (Kan.) took on Chapman, and Senator Styles Bridges (N. H.) attacked Brannan. Luckily, in both cases, the charges were so flimsy that they made no impact either on Congress or the country. Senator Schoeppel was so feeble in his attack that leading Republicans were soon repudiating him right and left. Senator Bridges tried to show that the Communist Party plotted to infiltrate and take over the Farmers' Union during the late 1930's and that the Brannan Plan is patterned after one proposed by the FU. Republican Senator William Langer (N. Dak.) came to the defense of the Farmers' Union so effectively that before long, even champion Red-hunter Senator Karl Mundt (N. Dak.) had to admit that "I have been advised the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities disclose that there are no Communist records or connections of any kind listed against any of the leaders of the Farmers' Union in South Dakota." Even those who wanted to believe Bridges found it difficult after that.

TRUMAN AGAINST FRANCO

President Truman has put Congress firmly in its place with regard to this country's relations with Franco Spain. The President could not have vetoed the $62.5 million handout to Spain recently voted by Congress without killing the entire $36 billion omnibus appropriation bill in which it was included. In signing the appropriation bill, however, Truman gave warning that he can and will withhold these funds from Franco indefinitely. "Money will be loaned to Spain whenever mutually advantageous arrangements can be made with respect to security, terms of repayment, purposes for which the money is to be spent, and other appropriate factors, and whenever such loans will serve the interests of the United States in the conduct of foreign relations."

The Administration opposed the provision *directing* the Economic Coöperation Administration to extend the loan

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Spain without requiring Franco to meet the same strict obligations which the Marshall Plan nations were required to accept. The Franco lobby, which has had the full coöperation of Senators Pat McCarran (D, Nev.) and Owen Brewster (R, Me.), considers the President's action a major setback. They are right.

WITCH-HUNTING IN EXCELSIS

A frightening example of the power and prestige of the Un-American Activities Committee came to light last week when the District of Columbia's Board of Education dropped the names of three educators as speakers for its teacher-training program because their names had been mentioned in "subversive" investigations before the House committee during the past several years. Last spring, Superintendent of Schools Hobart M. Corning compiled a list of 35 prospective speakers, and Adelbert Lee, chairman of the Board's Personnel Committee, asked the Un-American Activities Committee to clear them. The committee apparently keeps the names of known Communists along with that of every other person mentioned at any time before the committee. The three who were on the list were:

1. Dora B. Smith, the Un-American Activities Committee reported, was listed as a correspondent for the *Daily Worker* in October, 1936. This, however, turned out to be a case of mistaken identity.

2. Dr. Paul B. Cornely, the committee's sleuths found, had signed a statement against the Mundt anti-Communist bill in 1948. Dr. Cornely, an outstanding Negro physician and the Medical Director of Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, said he had opposed the bill because "it appeared to drive Communists underground," an opinion shared at that time by the then Attorney General Tom Clark and most of the members of Congress.

3. Dr. Alice V. Keliher, according to the committee's records, once signed a statement in opposition to procedures of the Un-American Activities Committee and was once named as "a sponsor and member" of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship. Dr. Keliher, a professor at New York University and an expert in the field of child development, said that during the last war, "while we were allies with Russia," she belonged to the group, though she was never a sponsor. She resigned long before the organization's name appeared on the Attorney General's list as subversive.

Superintendent Corning admitted that there was nothing in the information to indicate that any of the three was subversive, but he dropped them from his invitation list because "I wouldn't run the risk of employing anyone about whom there is any question at all."

The files of the Un-American Activities Committee are open to all government agencies and members of Congress. Any businessman anywhere can submit names to his Representative and have the committee check their loyalty. If the educators' names are an example of the workings of the "master file," the liberty rather than the security of the nation is in danger.

TROUBLE WITH YOUR NEIGHBOR? MAYBE WE CAN FIGURE OUT A "RED" ANGLE
PROFESSIONAL SUPER ANTI-SUBVERSIVES INC.
DON'T GO TO THE F.B.I. COME TO US!
24 HOUR SERVICE ON "COMMUNIST" RUMORS
PROTESTS SENT ANYWHERE 16 TYPEWRITERS NO WAITING
Stage Manager
HERBLOCK
THE WASHINGTON POST

"How much to do a job on a guy I'm understudying?"

THE FOLLY OF COMPROMISE

If the faculty of the University of California has learned any lesson from the recent controversy over non-Communist oaths, it is that to compromise is to invite defeat. During a year-long campaign of coercion by the University's Board of Regents, the faculty gradually began to rationalize and retreat. When the majority abandoned the few professors who stood firm against any infringement of academic freedom, the Regents were able to enforce their policy in full.

The Regents won the battle by taking a little more ground each time the faculty compromised. At first, 157 professors and non-academic personnel refused to sign a contract which included a non-Communist clause. The Regents "fired" them by not renewing their contracts. The faculty and Regents then agreed that those who did not sign the new contract would be permitted a hearing before a faculty tenure committee. The committee, if satisfied that those appearing were loyal, would recommend that the Regents renew their contracts. Of those who appeared, six were termed "uncoöperative" in that they refused to answer questions about their political opinions. The Regents fired them. Thirty-two testified to the satisfaction of the committee and were recommended by the committee for retention. In July, the Regents voted to retain the 32. In August, they reversed themselves, and by a vote of 12-10 gave the 32 professors 10 days to "sign or get out."

The institution is already feeling repercussions. Last week the American Psychological Association, meeting at State College, Pennsylvania, notified Governor Warren and University President Gordon Sproul that it was recommending to its members that they not accept positions as teachers or research personnel at the University of California "until such time as tenure conditions improve." One of the professors discharged by the University is Dr. Edward Chace Tolman, past president of the Psychological Association and a member of the University staff for 31 years.

The American Association of University Professors is preparing to make full investigation of the final action of the Regents.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUTSIDE AMERICA

The number of Europeans who have been relying on the Voice of America or the United States Information Service for the truth about Korea doesn't add up to more than an infinitesimally small fraction of the number of American taxpayers' dollars spent on these and other officially truth-crusading agencies of the US Government. On the other hand, the number of those who have depended on non-official fact-finding American sources has been very large. Never before has American newspaper material been republished so widely and in such volume in the press of all the major countries of Western Europe. The smaller sheets have used agency stories, the large ones the stories of special correspondents. In Paris, for example, *Le Figaro* has been taking the New York *Times* service, *Le Monde*, the New York *Herald Tribune* service.

One of the reasons for the use of American material has been the problem of cost: few European newspapers can afford to pay cable tolls. Another reason was the lack of welcome given by Colonel M. P. Echols, General Douglas MacArthur's press officer, to European reporters. A third reason, in a rather different category, explains why more American fact-finding (as opposed to truth-crusading) material was used at the end of the second month of the Korean war than at the start of the first month: it is that Americans were criticizing their own countrymen and their own country, and often in terms not even anti-American Europeans would permit themselves to use.

It wasn't surprising that *Le Monde*, the conservative newspaper which speaks for French neutralism, should be interested in giving its public Homer Bigart's explanation of why "some American units ran like scared rabbits" and why "the conduct of American squads and platoons under fire left much to be desired." The *Herald Tribune* correspondent wrote:

> The main trouble, most observers agree, is that this is a peacetime army composed mainly of youths who had no thought of fighting when they signed up. They are not combat-minded and it will take some time to make soldiers out of them. They went into the fight as though it were a picnic and promptly lost heart when it proved a tough and nasty assignment. For the human deficiencies there is no one to blame. Americans like to go soft in peacetime. But there is no excuse for deficiencies in basic field materials.

These remarks seem to confirm doubts about America—both its men and its material—which are part of the basis of neutralism. Naturally, *Le Monde* was glad to have an honest, informed American make them to a French reading public. Similarly, the same newspaper was pleased to have its Washington correspondent quote James Reston of the New York *Times* on "two popular illusions" in America: "First, the illusion that money is power, and second, the illusion that our atomic stockpile provides a good opportunity to give the Russians an ultimatum to behave or else."

The case of *Le Figaro* is different, for this conservative newspaper is the most pro-American in Paris. Yet its enthusiasm for American policy doesn't permit it to neglect the large (and growing) popular worry in France that American policy in Asia will lead to over-extension, hence to under-protection in Europe. So Walter Lippmann and other critics of American policy have been given great prominence. Moreover, *Le Figaro* chose among the many *Times* stories about Korea one from Walter Sullivan in Tokyo, saying that the GI view of South Koreans as "gooks" was doing political damage. The same story said:

> United States soldiers have been trained to fight a war, but this is a combination of war and revolution. The Communist soldiers have been trained as a weapon of political as well as military conquest. GIs from the farms and cities of the United States have been assigned to a job of ministering to the greatest problem of our era—the clash between Communism and Western democracy. . . . The critical question is whether the United States soldiers can be educated into an understanding of Korea and her problems.

Material of this sort has also been republished widely in England. In addition, pro-American conservative newspapers like the London *Observer* have opened their columns to dispatches telling of Asiatic criticism of American policy and conduct. For example, Rawle Knox wrote from New Delhi:

> Much of the Indian press has been reporting United States reverses in Korea with studied glee, because of a widespread conviction that the Americans are the heirs of European colonialism in Asia. . . . In Asia, imperialism, not Communism, is the word which arouses the depths of rage and fear. Wherever in Asia a struggle that is Communist-led appears to be one for a nation's freedom, India's sympathies are with Communism. . . . In Europe, the words "Russian imperialism" are a phrase of dire import; in India they are a quite meaningless expression. To India, imperialism is an attribute of the West European nations and of America. . . .

The impression given by the Voice of America, the USIS and other official American truth-crusading agencies is that American official and public opinion considers such views to be Communist or at least pro-Communist. But the impression given by the non-official American correspondents is that a refusal or an inability on the part of Americans to face the facts (for example, that the fight in Korea is "a combination of war and revolution") is not only confusing the real issues but building an edifice of apparent military strength on a foundation of moral and psychological weakness.

It is no news for André Siegfried to write in *Le Figaro* that the French are now in the mood of 1939 rather than that of 1914, that "after three wars and three invasions in less than a century France is tired—tired of war and just tired," and that "we have fallen again to a moral level that is hardly better than that of the years 1930 to 1940 when our defeat was in preparation."

It *is* news—and bad news for that small (and dwindling) minority of Western Europeans who hold on to their faith in the American people—that the young Americans by whom Europe and the rest of the world must perforce judge all Americans seem in 1950 to be so poorly prepared not only morally and psychologically but simply in knowledge of the facts of the crusade in which they were called upon to fight and die.

PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EMPIRE STATE POLITICS

by Robert G. Spivack

SOME AMBITIONS die hard. The Democrats had their William Jennings Bryan early in the century. The Republicans now have Thomas E. Dewey.

For the two years since his 1948 humiliation Dewey has been brooding. To all his friends he kept repeating that he was politically dead and that he was resigned to the fact. He dispersed his Albany "team" and found good jobs for all his loyal associates. In mid-June he said that he intended to return to private law practice.

Now he is running for a third term as Governor on a "war-crisis" or what Westbrook Pegler might call the "indispensable-man" ticket. When everybody thought the fight was all over and Harry S. Truman had been proclaimed the champ, Dewey jumped back into the ring and said he did not hear the bell.

I believed, as did most New York political reporters, that Dewey meant it when he said he was quitting. But while his family really wanted some privacy, Dewey apparently regarded retirement as oblivion. After the nation's initial approval of the Administration's Communist-containing decision wore off and we realized we faced a tough fight in Korea, Dewey decided to reënter the picture. American troops were doing badly. This was it!

In his very first campaign speech Dewey made it clear that he regards the New York campaign as a continuation of his earlier fight with the President. But he and his associates deny that the New York gubernatorial race is only a warm-up for 1952 so far as he is concerned. He will not run again for the White House, he insists. But who will believe him now?

This time, New Yorkers are told, he will not be "tongue-tied Tommy." He will tell the people where he stands on all issues. He will fight on the beaches, on the radio and on the street corners, he promised, paraphrasing the more eloquent language of Winston Churchill. A Brooklyn state senator, scornful when Dewey, to the surprise of his closest friends, renounced his no-third-term pledge, said: "The only Korea he is interested in is spelled c-a-r-e-e-r."

If Dewey never seriously meant it when he said he was retiring, then he proved temporarily foxier than the New York Democrats. He kept them guessing right up to the last minute. Their strongest candidate was undoubtedly Representative Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr. But when the Democrats were fairly certain that Dewey would not run, they turned to their secondary choices.

The Democratic state convention, dominated by Boss Edward J. Flynn, ended up with a relatively unknown Bronx Congressman to run against Dewey. The legislator, Representative Walter A. Lynch, has a splendid voting record in Washington. But he has never publicly taken the lead in any important battles, preferring to work quietly behind the scenes. Flynn himself is no mean strategist. While he realizes that Dewey outsmarted him momentarily, he takes the view that the Governor is now at his political peak as a result of the third-term "draft," and that his popularity is likely to decline as the campaign progresses.

The hub upon which Flynn hopes the state campaign will turn is the New York mayoralty race. The Bronx boss, fearful that the corruption of the former administration would soon blow up in the party's face, engineered the deal whereby Mayor William O'Dwyer retired and was given a diplomatic appointment. Sixty-eight-year-old State Supreme Court Justice Ferdinand Pecora is the Democratic nominee, running against State Industrial Commissioner Edward Corsi for the Republicans, Paul Ross for the American Labor Party, and Acting Mayor Vincent Impellitteri as an independent. Pecora is one of the few city Democrats whom the Liberal Party is willing to back.

If Pecora proves the powerful vote-getter Flynn thinks he is, then the big-city vote may offset Dewey's large upstate majority.

The Democrats this year are backing Senator Herbert H. Lehman for a full six-year term. For nearly two decades Lehman has been the Democrats' most powerful vote magnet.

Dewey's publicity squadron has operated thus far with the smoothness—slickness some call it—for which it has become noted. But one unforeseen development has marred the Dewey campaign.

A few days before he consented to seek a third term, Winthrop Aldrich called a meeting in the board room of the Chase National Bank to urge that Dewey reconsider. The Democrats immediately picked it up and said that Dewey had yielded to a "bank draft."

At this juncture the odds are that Dewey will be re-elected if he can succeed in making the public believe that Washington, not Moscow, is responsible for the Korean war. But the Democrats are counting heavily on public distaste for making political capital out of national tragedy.

Dewey has an unfortunate propensity for exaggeration. If he keeps blaming the Korean war on Truman, someone may yet accuse him of being pro-Communist.

Robert G. Spivack is political reporter for the New York Post and co-author of Our Sovereign State.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ATOM IN PEACE AND WAR

by Leon Svirsky

A MAN OF THE nineteenth century who returned to earth in 1950 would surely be overwhelmed by the twentieth century's achievements in science: flying machines that can span the Atlantic in five hours; wireless machines that snatch from the ether the image of happenings hundreds of miles away; a telescope that looks a billion light-years into space; factories without hands; cities lighted by the throw of a switch; the bacterial diseases of mankind all but conquered by wonder drugs; the life expectancy of the average man nearly doubled. Yet everywhere this visitor would find scientists regarded not with admiration but with almost hysterical fear. To the average civilized man of 1950 science no longer means primarily the promise of a more abundant life; it means the atomic bomb.

What the atom may ultimately come to mean to the twentieth century is not yet, despite the paralyzing panic of our time, altogether determined. We need to remind ourselves again and again that atomic energy is a phenomenon of nature with vast potentialities for good as well as for evil, and that the use to be made of it lies in our own hands.

What is this atom that has become our fateful concern? When Henri Becquerel first looked into the nucleus of the atom in 1896, having discovered it accidentally through the mysterious emissions of radioactivity that fogged his photographic plates, he opened up a completely new world, just as Leeuwenhoek had when he first looked through a microscope, Columbus when he discovered America, and Freud when he discovered the unconscious. It was a world of forces at play on a scale that men had never dreamed of—a jungle populated by protons, neutrons, electrons, positrons, mesons, neutrinos and no one knows how many more forms of energy. Whereas a chemical reaction such as the burning of wood releases about four electron volts of energy, the physical reaction that splits the nucleus of uranium yields 200 million electron volts of energy. Thus the opening of the nucleus unloosed an energy that is 50 million times greater than any hitherto known.

The story of the development of the uranium bomb and its use in World War II is too well known to need rehearsal here. The Hiroshima-type bomb was only a beginning in atomic weapons; the latest designs are reported to be six times as powerful as the Hiroshima model, and the fission bomb itself may soon be obsolete—a mere trigger for the yet more horrible hydrogen bomb.

The idea of the H-bomb follows the A-bomb as the night the day. The hydrogen fusion reaction on which the H-bomb would be based requires tremendously high temperatures, and the only way to create anything approaching the heat necessary to set it off on the earth is to detonate a fission bomb, whose explosion is estimated to yield some 300 million degrees centigrade. The essential difference between the two types of bomb is that while the fission bomb is limited to a certain critical size, the fusion bomb, if it can be made at all, can be built to almost any size simply by adding fuel. A single fusion-fission bomb might be made large enough to destroy New York or any other metropolitan area.

Two points about the H-bomb that have received relatively little attention in the press need to be emphasized. One is that there is still a great deal of doubt, both on theoretical and practical grounds, that a hydrogen bomb can be made, and if it can, that it would divert facilities from the production of A-bombs. The $260 million just appropriated for a new plant to make H-bomb fuel could of course have been used to increase production of A-bomb fuel. Considering the limited usefulness of the H-bomb—it would be suitable only for the very largest targets—this is an important strategic consideration. The second point is that the fusion reaction can produce only an explosion; unlike fission, it cannot be harnessed to any constructive purpose.

Atomic bombs, A or H, by no means exhaust the list of possible atomic weapons. The Atomic Energy Commission discloses in its latest semi-annual report that it is studying the feasibility of radiological warfare. The atomic piles that make bomb fuel also produce considerable amounts of radioactive fission products, so dangerous that their disposal is a major problem; most of them are now buried in sealed concrete containers. From this material a deadly dust could be made; strewn over cities in a layer so thin that it would be invisible, the dust would be lethal to all who breathed it. It is estimated that the atomic piles at Hanford now produce enough fission products each month to poison the atmosphere of two or three cities the size of New York.

Thus far, the military atom, unfortunately, has overshadowed the atom's beneficent possibilities. Yet if atomic energy does not first annihilate us, it can raise us to a level of health and control over nature that will

This is the ninth in a series of articles reporting on some aspects of American civilization at the twentieth century's halfway mark.

Leon Svirsky, managing editor of Scientific American, was born in Hartford, Connecticut, and graduated from Yale. He has done newspaper work on the staffs of the New York World and the New York World-Telegram and Sun, and was for some years with Time.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make the civilization of 1950 seem primitive indeed. Let us begin with the isotopes, so deadly in a bomb, so brilliant with promise for research and medicine. Already, the alchemy of atomic science has produced more than 1,000 isotopes, most of them radioactive, and has given all the elements—and thus potentially every type of compound substance—new forms of activity and identification. The radioactive isotopes can be detected and identified even in amounts too small to be seen under a microscope. Their migrations and metamorphoses can be traced from one layer of metal to another, from root to leaf, from organ to organ, from cell to cell.

In medicine radioisotopes can be used directly for helpful treatments, notably against cancer. One of their uses is in surgery for brain tumors. In operating on a tumor the surgeon must cut out all of the malignant cells, but in the brain he cannot safely remove extra tissue around the tumor for insurance, and often the tumor itself is not easy to locate. Tumor cells have an affinity for phosphorus; they absorb up to 100 times as much of this substance as does normal brain tissue. The surgeon injects a little radioactive phosphorus into the patient's bloodstream; the radiophosphorus that reaches the brain is concentrated in the tumor, and with the help of a tiny radioactivity detector the surgeon can locate the malignant tissue and excise it with precision.

A radioactive substance may itself destroy cancer cells, just as X-rays do. The best-known example, of course, is radium. Nuclear science has developed radioactive cobalt, far less costly, more flexible and less dangerous than radium. There are at least two radioisotopes, and more may yet be found, that can be injected into the general circulation to hunt down and attack cancer cells. One is radioiodine, which has been used with some effect in a few cases of cancer of the thyroid. Another is radiophosphorus, which seems to have a general avidity for cancer cells, not only in the brain but also in the stomach, skin and blood. Radiophosphorus has proved helpful in some cases of leukemia, a cancer of the blood, and it is being investigated as a possible treatment for cancer of the stomach and of the skin. Radioisotopes have also been more or less effective in the treatment of the blood disorder known as polycythemia vera, in relieving angina pectoris, congestive heart failure, hyperthyroidism and in the diagnosis of nutritional and hormone deficiencies.

Nevertheless, radioisotopes cannot have any important future in medical treatment as such, since basically radiation is harmful to living tissue. It is as a research tool for investigating the chemistry of the body that they will play their most important role in conquering disease.

Investigations with tracer isotopes have already yielded a great deal of new and surprising information about the blood, about the importance of enzymes in metabolism and about serious diseases such as diabetes and high blood pressure. The tracer studies of the blood have been especially useful, and they have turned up information that could not have been obtained in any other way. For example, they have shown that red blood cells have a stable life span very much like that of the body as a whole; the average red cell lives about four months, barring accident or disease, and dies of old age. Other important tracer studies have revised some old ideas about anemia. It used to be thought that the deficiency of hemoglobin in anemic patients was due simply to lack of iron in the body, but biochemists now know that this is not always true. Some anemias do not yield to iron treatment but do yield to hormones and a high protein diet. In fact, the tracers disclose that the body uses its iron over and over and cannot assimilate much more than one to two-thousandths of a gram of iron per day, even under forced feeding. What may easily go wrong, however, is the ability of cells to take up iron. This puts a new complexion on the problem; medical science gives up the futile effort to stuff the body with extra iron and turns to the more significant study of how to enable the body to use effectively the iron it has.

Tagged atoms are at work searching out useful facts in many other fields: in physics, geology, mining and metallurgy, oil prospecting and research, industrial chemistry, textiles, electronics, ceramics, pharmacology, brewing, and agriculture. What makes a metal corrode? How is it affected by alloys? What elements does a plant need from the soil? What is the secret of photosynthesis, the process by which plants convert the energy of the sun with high efficiency into forms of energy usable by man? To these and many other questions, isotopic research promises to yield immensely valuable answers.

Important as the isotopes are, however, they are only a by-product of atomic energy. A single small uranium pile at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory in Tennessee has sufficed to produce nearly all the radioisotopes the world requires. When all is said and done, the paramount gift that the atom offers to man is energy, either to turn wheels, run machines and enrich life—or to blow up civilization.

To the constructive harnessing of nuclear power comparatively little attention has yet been given. The relative emphasis on the constructive v. the military aspects of atomic energy may be measured by the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission has spent considerably less than 10 percent of its budget on the development of projects that can fairly be considered nonmilitary. To be sure, the Commission contends that most of the expenditures on bomb material and other

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aspects of the weapons program will bear constructive fruits, but progress toward putting nuclear energy usefully to work has been extremely slow, and the diversion of the H-bomb has now forced the AEC to halt much of its long-range experimental work along that line.

The power problem admittedly is difficult; there are huge problems to be solved in designing a uranium pile, or reactor, to produce useful heat for conversion into electricity or other forms of power. What are the technical difficulties? One is that a power reactor would have to operate at high temperatures in order to transfer efficiently the concentrated heat it is capable of producing. Another is that the intense radiations in the pile poison its materials by altering their physical properties. This means that a power reactor will work only if new materials that withstand heat and radiation can be developed.

A solution must also be found for the problem of creating sufficient fissionable fuel. The fissionable isotope U-235 does not exist in the earth in quantities large enough to warrant serious consideration as a common fuel. But the fission of U-235 can convert U-238 into fissionable plutonium, and if reactors can be designed that will breed new plutonium fuel as the U-235 is consumed, the potential supply of nuclear fuel becomes very large indeed. Moreover, the same process that converts common uranium into plutonium can also convert thorium into fissionable U-233, and thorium is as common as U-238.

Probably the most troublesome problem is the inordinately complicated chemistry involved in the processing and recycling of fuel. Reactor engineers remark that the recycling of fuel in such a power plant would be much like replacing an aircraft engine every 1,000 hours—and starting the overhaul of the old engine by dissolving it in nitric acid! Yet the engineers are talking, and preliminary studies encourage their talk, of solving all these problems in one package—a so-called homogeneous reactor in which the fissionable material will be mixed with the moderator and coolant and most of the processes, *e. g.*, the breeding of new fuel, will be carried on in a continuous operation instead of by the present slow-batch processes.

That the technical problems are not insurmountable is indicated by the fact that the Atomic Energy Commission and its contractors have all but completed designs for four experimental reactors. One will test reactor materials; one will test the breeding principle (*i. e.*, producing power and new fuel at the same time); the other two will be prototypes of nuclear ships' engines. Some of these pilot plants may be in operation by 1951 or 1952.

Yet even these belated projects are primarily military. They have been pushed forward by the urging of the Navy and the Air Force, which are actively interested in harnessing nuclear energy to drive warships and bombers. This objective unquestionably can be accomplished, but it will have very little bearing on the economics of nuclear energy. A nuclear engine that can drive a submarine around the world without refueling will not need to count the cost. To demonstrate the economic value of nuclear energy for more ordinary purposes is quite another project. It will require vast research to develop new materials and new chemical and engineering techniques, and it will call for a great deal more money, manpower and drive than have yet been bestowed on it.

The harnessing of nuclear energy is an economic as well as a technical problem. Obviously nuclear fuel must compete in cost with coal or other cheap fuels if it is to justify the expense of developing it. Great effort will be necessary to find out, but in this respect nuclear fission stands in the same position as Faraday's discovery of electric currents a century ago.

The stakes are not small. A single pound of fissionable uranium contains as much energy as two and a half million pounds of coal. On that basis it is for all practical purposes a costless and weightless fuel. Assuming that the technical problem of building plants to burn it economically is soluble, some engineers estimate that it will certainly be as cheap as coal in regions distant from coal sources. And there is hardly any doubt of the supply of nuclear fuel. There is enough uranium and thorium in the earth, of commercial grades alone, to supply the entire power consumption of the world at present rates for 100 years. Lower-grade sources of uranium, such as oil shales and gold ores, are estimated to be sufficient to supply the world for at least 1,000 years, even if we used no other sources of energy.

Mankind is using up fuel resources at a fantastic rate. In another half-century our petroleum will be gone, and coal may be uneconomic to mine in many regions. Even now in many areas of the world—parts of China, India and the USSR, South America, South Africa, Japan—energy sources are so scant that industrialization requires, or would require, a huge investment in transportation of fuel. As the peoples of the backward areas awaken to the power of industrialization to enlarge their lives, they will surely begin to look hungrily to the possibilities in nuclear energy, especially where, as in China, the goal is a system of decentralized industry. Enough nuclear fuel could be carted in a small truck to start a TVA in a remote wilderness. And ultimately the benefits of nuclear power may be appreciated in every nation; uranium-fueled plants might well heat our cities more cheaply than coal or oil.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Such is the role the atom could play in a peaceful world. It is man's misfortune that the military got the atom first, before its more beneficent aspects could begin to be explored and to build the model of a more abundant civilization. There is a complacent feeling among wishful thinkers that somehow it will work out all right: that the military development of the atom, if allowed to run its course, will inevitably be translated into the uses of peace. Nothing could be more illusory. Aside from the difficulty of persuading the military and its chauvinistic supporters in all countries to yield up their stockpiles of fissionable material once the arsenals are stocked with this overpowering weapon, most of the present atomic-energy enterprise is of questionable value for any peaceful purpose. The great U-235 separation plants at Oak Ridge, for example, are unnecessary from the standpoint of non-military application, because a nuclear-power plant would operate on natural uranium and plutonium, not on separated U-235.

It is also illusory to suppose that the atom can be developed for war and for peace simultaneously—on parallel tracks, so to speak. The military has all the priorities on every facility from raw uranium to scientific brains. In an atomic-arms race a project like the hydrogen bomb —and doubtless worse horrors to come—will always take precedence over non-military projects. It becomes steadily more evident that man must choose between a military atom and a peaceful atom; he cannot have both.

NEXT STEPS FOR THE WEST

by Michael Straight

IN THREE ARTICLES on the future of the Western nations I suggested these conclusions:

Military security requires military union.

Economic progress requires economic union.

Military and economic union require some measure of political union.

The pressures of common military, economic and political problems have led the Western nations toward union. Yet so far it has been restricted to the executive level of governments acting independently, and without direct recourse to public opinion. This system, I have suggested, is incapable of bringing about the minimum political unity that we need.

Its inadequacies are illustrated every day.

In Indo-China the United States is committed to underwriting France, although we have no sympathy for her policies and no means of advocating that they be changed.

In Korea American troops retreated for a month while European nations debated whether or not it was their war.

In Formosa we acted alone, and the governments of Europe protested that they were not bound by our decisions.

These costly misunderstandings are not mere blunders. They are inherent in the nature of our partnership.

In any unspoken alliance between greater and lesser nations, the strongest nation makes the decisions. The others are pulled along in its wake, insisting as they go that they are acting independently in accordance with their own sovereign wills. Sooner or later the citizens of the smaller nations must realize that they have been misled. They must come to understand that they can regain a greater measure of control over their own destinies by advancing their claims in federal councils than by keeping up the pretense of national sovereignty long after they have surrendered it to a nation strong enough to be sovereign. Meanwhile endless recrimination occurs, with the smaller nations accusing the strongest of applying illegal pressures, only to be cursed as cowards for hesitating when indecision is fatal for all.

Are the Western nations ready to advance toward union, either in one stage or in two stages of which the first is European federation? Is there a general will for union strong enough to overcome all the resistances that stand in its way?

The economic resistances of high-cost producers to unification can be met with economic remedies.

The logistical resistances of generals to military unification can be met with overwhelming logistical arguments.

How do we overcome the subterranean psychological resistances to unification that smolder in every man?

For pride and prejudice, superstition and shibboleth, complacence and ignorance, are formidable barriers to an emerging society for which there are no comparable remedies.

Police terror can crush Europeans into a silent, inert mass. Habit, however irrational, can hold them apart until they go down one by one.

How do free nations reconcile conflicting cultures and attitudes?

There is an old saying about a traveler on a Spanish train: if he criticizes Germany he is French; if he praises Britain he is British; if he condemns Spain he is Spanish.

The saying is still true. It is as dangerous to over-

This is the fourth and last of a series of articles under the general title, "Can the Atlantic Countries Unite?"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

estimate our common values as to underestimate our common needs. Even where the central characteristics of democracy are held in common, they may be held for quite different reasons. Tolerance in Britain tends to arise from a sense of innate strength; in France from indifference or cynicism; in Italy from the non-application of ethics to politics.

The contrasts between the traditions of continental Europe and those of Britain and Scandinavia are deep and hard to overcome. For centuries the nations of continental Europe have been wracked by every kind of conflict. It breeds a need for ideology. Declarations of principle and purpose are the indispensable means of clarification by which contending forces summon their support and will. Written constitutions are the means by which neutral groups seek to survive.

France is a classical example of a nation born in conflict. Enemies abroad, feudalism at home, monarchy in Paris, tyranny in the provinces, have led to deep contrasts within France: between centralized government and a contempt among the people for all authority; between national pride and deep disunity; between a dedication to abstract logic and a lack of practicality in public affairs. All issues become ideological in France; and as André Maurois writes, "Ideological conflicts are far more perilous among the French than among the realistic Anglo-Saxons."

Nationalism may have been a major force in France. But the endorsement, by a third of her citizens, of a party whose sworn allegiance is to the Soviet government indicates that nationalism needs to be identified with a new and great idea. That is in accordance with French tradition. For five centuries, as Etienne Gilson points out, "everything which was French was universal and everything which was universal was French." As a result, both in resources and programs, "the French," as Maurois concludes, "find themselves drawn by their traditions to maintain a way of life beyond their means." The federal parliaments, courts and councils for Europe and the West for which French leaders plead may be a means of escaping from the hard tasks that France and all Western nations must undertake. They may also form the only framework within which France can achieve the will to master these tasks. That is what the British forget.

For, in profound contrast, the history and tradition of Britain lead her to cleave to practicable, hard-headed plans. Britain, alone among nations, has combined class conflict and national unity. She possesses a higher degree of cohesiveness and self-confidence than any other nation. No religious and civil wars in modern days have left their scars on England. The bitter industrial conflicts of the nineteenth century that gave rise to Socialist theory have largely passed away. The British people never work from principles to policies. They address themselves to the tasks at hand.

British nationalism has been expansive and is becoming insular. Conservatives foster the ancient illusion of empire sufficiency. The Labour Party has created new illusions. One is the belief that Britain under socialism is the master of her own fate, able to assure the living standards and well-being of her citizens regardless of world developments. Another illusion is the fiction, staunchly upheld by Labour's pamphlets and energetically denied by the actions of the government, that "no socialist policy could accept a system by which important fields of national policy were surrendered to a permanent anti-socialist majority."

There are, of course, far deeper sources of the insularity to which these phrases appeal. For this generation the great formative experience has been the battle of Britain. It has led to a revulsion against ties to continental Europe, and a spirited assurance that Britain's strength lies in her own manhood, standing on her own shores.

International innovations are viewed with alarm in Britain. Richard Crossman in the House of Commons summed up Britain's opposition to the Schuman Plan: no supranational authority without federal union; and no federal union!

If more than committees are needed to bind free peoples together, then for the British the answer is the Commonwealth. It is not held together by constitutions, declarations, parliaments, councils and courts. It is a family, presided over by the King, protected by the mother country, loyal to the Union Jack. These unwritten psychological ties are far more subtle and compelling than bonds of treaty and law.

But their grip is strengthened by common origins, common experiences and common language. And much as the free nations need focal points for common loyalties, their diversities are too great to be held by family ties alone.

The British are a sensible people, moved by reason and fact. To a casual traveler, they seem ready today for a far wider union with the United States, once the need is made clear. The nations of Europe, and particularly those dominated by Catholicism, they neither understand nor respect.

Nor are they willing to move very far in order to satisfy the psychological needs of other peoples. Three centuries of training in the management of other nations have left in Britain an unconscious but rigid assumption that Western unity must be achieved by imposing British methods on her partners, rather than by the meshing of contrasting cultures in a common synthesis.

These clashes in attitudes within Europe resound in all our common councils. It is not always a conflict be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween Britain and France, yet the contrast in their attitudes is significant.

The French propose the pooling of resources for rearmament. The British see this plan as a dodge by which France hopes to avoid the hardship and disciplines of as much rearmament as Britain has undertaken. France sees in federation a source of new strength; Britain, a confirmation of French weakness. French leaders argue that federation is necessary for the unity of their nation; the British reply that France's domestic problems are her own concern. The French government adds that a European parliament is necessary to tie together the threads that bind that continent. The British retort that a government which is unable to collect taxes from its own people has no business levying taxes on other peoples.

The French government goes to Strasbourg to demand sovereignty for a European assembly. The British send Hugh Dalton to freeze whatever warmth is generated there. Dalton, the arch-doctrinaire, uses Socialist phrases to tear down what the Socialists of Europe most desire; but his views reflect at heart the caution, conservatism and complacency of Whitehall. His arguments are drawn from the musty pages of a Foreign Office memorandum written in condemnation of Briand's proposals for a United States of Europe, 25 years ago.

These are the conflicts that lead to a dead end in Western Europe. The Benelux countries have favored federation; for Germany and Italy it is the only alternative to a reversion to aggressive nationalism. The Scandinavian countries support the British attitude, and Britain will not join a European federation or tolerate one from which she is absent.

Until now, if there has been any long-range US policy, it has been that European federation was the first step toward a wider association of the Western nations. Our government hoped that federation would bring about the increase in productivity in Europe necessary for free trade with the US. It assumed that the ties between the nations of Europe were closer than those between Europe and the US. It believed that a confederation of Western nations could function if Europe spoke with one voice. It reasoned—unconsciously perhaps—that by placing European federation first on the Western agenda, we could delay the moment at which Americans would face the transfer of their own sovereignty.

For the reasons outlined here, these arguments no longer apply. Progress towards Atlantic Union is the best way to bring the nations of Europe closer together.

It is true that there exist economic, political and psychological conflicts between Europe and the US that are not present within Europe. Yet against these sources of division are the growing bonds between the US and Europe: the knowledge that Europe lacks the force to act as a balance of power, that it can be defended only with the aid of American troops, that in all military, economic and political endeavors the Western nations can succeed only if they act together. The US alone can give vitality to an association of democratic nations. Our strength is not limited to our resources alone. In national outlook we stand between Britain and continental Europe.

If our need is to think in terms of the Atlantic community, how do we move ahead?

To bring into being now the final institutions of a government of the free world would raise to the surface hidden conflicts, causing fresh quarrels, and costly diversions of energy. It would be premature until the future of the United Nations is clarified.

In addition, many of the classical powers of federal government are irrelevant in the common tasks we face today.

If we start from today's task our next steps will be these:

First, a declaration by the governments of the Atlantic community that they stand together; that their resources will be held in common, and directed on the basis of fair shares and over-all considerations to a combined effort for survival.

Second, the transformation of the Organization for European Economic Coöperation into an economic council for the Atlantic community, charged with directing a combined economic effort for equipping our armed forces, advancing recovery in Europe, and raising living standards overseas through a long-range mutual program of capital investment.

Third, the reorganization of the Brussels command, the North Atlantic Treaty organization, and the Military Assistance Program into a military council of the Atlantic community, charged with the creation of an Atlantic armed force.

Fourth, the replacement of the Council of Foreign Ministers by a Supreme council of the Atlantic community, with full authority over the military and economic councils. This supreme council would be representative of the legislatures as well as the executives of each nation.

If these proposals seem remote from present preoccupations, that is one measure of the inadequacy of our leadership, not only among governments that run along grooves that lead to nowhere, but among Socialists who have forgotten that internationalism was their birthright, trade unionists concerned only with pay envelopes, and citizens resigned to war. Extraordinary efforts will not be made under the pretense that these are ordinary times. We know that, faced with today's slow progress and immense tasks, Roosevelt and Churchill would advance our efforts as part of a grand design.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: "Gimme $60 Million"

THE DOLLAR shipping interests of San Francisco, once saved from bankruptcy by Uncle Sam, are now demanding that the government give them property worth some $60 million. To tell the whole story, we need to go back to the special Senate committee to investigate air-mail and ocean-mail contracts of which Senator (now Supreme Court Justice) Hugo L. Black was chairman. It is a difficult tale to relate because of the corporations within corporations, the corporate shells, the subsidiaries, the holding companies, the intricate and interrelating interests of members of the Dollar family, the relationship with West Coast banking concerns and other shipping companies, and the weaving in and out of important political figures.

The various Dollar companies found themselves in financial difficulties in the early twenties as the result of the large salaries and other sums paid to members of the family and their associates. What saved the Dollar Line from bankruptcy was its purchase by the US Shipping Board, under whose management it made a net operating profit of $6,767,858 in a short time. The US Shipping Board changed the name of the company to American President Lines, Limited, and soon began to make a profit. It paid off all debts, bought additional ships, and built up an adequate working capital. The assets of the company today, as the result of government operation, are in excess of $60 million. The Dollar interests, having sold out to the government, now want back again as a free gift what they sold.

Dollars, dollars, who got the dollars? As a striking example of how the family interests realized the value of money, consider the Pacific Lighterage Corporation, whose ownership intermeshed closely with that of the Dollar Line and which serviced that company's ships. From 1929 to 1933 inclusive, according to the Black report, this company, on a capitalization of $10,000, after paying large salaries to its officers who were also officers of allied mail-contract and shipping companies, made a profit of $1,175,182.

Even earlier, R. Stanley Dollar, the chief of the tribe, had received from his Dollar Steamship Line (and the affiliated Admiral Orient Line) $698,750 as a commission for the purchase of ships from the United States Government. On January 10, 1924, Mr. Dollar drew down a further commission of $192,500 for buying certain steamers from the US Shipping Board. In 1926, his corporation paid him $225,000 for purchasing ships from the government. Although buying ships for his company would seem to fall within the scope of his employment, Mr. Dollar thus got it both coming and going. Altogether, from 1923 to halfway through 1934, R. Stanley Dollar drew down from his companies $2,526,501, while his brother, J. Harold Dollar, had to be satisfied with a mere $1,081,693. In 1929, a depression year, R. Stanley Dollar was benefited to the extent of only $419,000 and J. Harold Dollar, of $187,747. The following year, the take of Stanley Dollar was $345,933 and of Harold, $209,102. Even in 1931, Stanley received $216,477 and his brother Harold, $110,896. These sums included generous salaries, bonuses and emoluments.

This enormous drain upon the resources of the Dollar Line could not be met without subsidies and loans by the US Government. In the summer of 1938, the Dollar Line owed the government some $7 million, for which the Dollar Company of California and R. Stanley Dollar were sureties. By a so-called adjustment agreement, the common stock of the Dollar Company of Delaware was "transferred, sold and assigned" to the US Maritime Commission to release Dollar of California and R. Stanley Dollar from liability for the Delaware Company's debt to the government. This deal saved the company from bankruptcy and R. Stanley Dollar from a possible substantial financial loss.

Since the Maritime Commission took over the line, it has been successfully operated. Instead of teetering on the edge of bankruptcy, the company has repaid to the government the money Dollar borrowed. It should be emphasized that R. Stanley Dollar has not repaid a cent of this debt which he incurred and for which he had assumed personal liability. Now that the company has been rescued from its precarious financial situation resulting from Dollar management, those interests are cheekily demanding that the 92 percent of the common stock of the company which they sold and transferred to the Maritime Commission, be returned to them.

R. Stanley Dollar and his associates filed a suit in the US District Court for the District of Columbia claiming that the stock that had been *sold* to the Maritime Commission had been merely pledged and that, since the debt has been repaid, they were entitled to the return of the property. Now that the property is prosperous, with no thanks to them, they are quite willing to take it back as a free gift.

The District Court held that there was an outright sale to the government of the stock of the Dollar Line. Dollar appealed to the US Circuit Court of Appeals. This court, with Justices Clark, Miller and Prettyman sitting, decided on July 17 last that the Dollars had not sold their stock; they had merely pledged it. (Another article will follow.)

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

CUMMINGS AND HAYES: MR. JOY AND MR. GLOOM

by M. L. Rosenthal

THE WORK of E. E. Cummings has other distinctions than his well-known distrust of conventional capitalization and his lust for parentheses and quotation marks that begin but do not end, or end but do not begin. Because of these other distinctions, no one really hates him for the coy prettiness of some of his posturing—as, for instance, when he imagines "a cheerfulest Elephantangelchild" on a cloud

> where his heartlike ears have flown
> adorable him
> self tail and all (and his head's red
> christmas bow). . . .

For Cummings, we know by now, is as sentimentally *toujours gai* about life and love in general as he is impatient with all forms of authority and stuffiness. We accept the further fact that he forever strives to shock a long-anesthetized bourgeoisie and forever galvanizes himself instead, because the colloquial impudence and emotional freshness of his style help restore our faith in the importance of our own experience.

XAIPE, by E. E. Cummings (Oxford University Press; $2.50).
WELCOME TO THE CASTLE, by Alfred Hayes (Harper; $2.50).

Moreover, most of us in some degree share Cummings' "naïve" devotion to the clichés of romantic Bohemianism—the love-swoon, and sex-über-alles, and the mystic superiority of the artist, and down-with-the-brass, and boys and girls o so happy in the great big circus. We want it all to be true, and Cummings reassures us by being so purely and delicately aware, through the sheer sensuousness of his perceptions, of how alive we can be and how much there is to respond to. His broken lines and shuffled sentences and exploded words reveal a world charged with excitement, beauty and comedy. When not too facile, the technique is still a convincing kind of rhetoric. It is the old, attractive Cummings who argues, in his closing poem, that if only we are "innocent" enough, the new moon can teach us its "keen illimitable secret of begin":

> (whying diminutive bright deathlessness
> to these my not themselves believing eyes
> adventurous, enormous, nowhere from)

and whose sonnet on Chaucer pictures "honour corruption villainy holiness" all "riding in fragrance of sunlight" together in a poet's-gesture toward eternity:

> down while crylessly drifting through vast
> most
> nothing's own nothing children go of dust

So his plea for innocence is compelling, because he seems open to all meanings and because he makes his images, his sensations and feelings, seem quite new and spontaneous. But Cummings' satirical poetry, though always amusing and at times sharp and poisonous, has never been as finely or seriously motivated as the purer lyric writing. Hatred of war, for instance, has inspired some of his most telling irony; yet his pacifist satire lacks immediacy and depends mainly on a sort of parody of the jingoist, and a caricaturing of the by-products of militarism, for its successes. Cummings can be shallow, as witness the mountains of sophomoric abuse dumped on respectable elderly ladies and gentlemen, timid virgins and stupid generals. And as the years have gone by, he has included in the lists of his cant-spewing "enemies" more and more categories—liberals, Communists, trade unions, Roosevelt, and so on—so that in addition to the Bohemian and hedonistic contexts he has provided what seems to be a less "innocent" reactionary-political one.

The dilemma into which this fact sometimes pushes a would-be sympathetic reader is interestingly illustrated in a pair of poems written at different times. The first, poem 135 in the collected volume which appeared in 1938, reads as follows:

> IKEY (GOLDBERG)'S WORTH I'M
> TOLD $ SEVERAL MILLION
> FINKLESTEIN (FRITZ) LIVES
> AT THE RITZ WEAR
> earl & wilson COLLARS

The second, number 46 in the present volume, is almost equally brief:

> A kike is the most dangerous
> machine as yet invented
> by even yankee ingenu
> ity (out of a jew a few
> dead dollars and some twisted laws)
> it comes both prigged and canted

In the earlier piece, the comedy of the jazzy rhythms, the pictorial handling of upper- and lower-case letters and the tricky presentation of the theme cannot hide from us the hackneyed anti-Semitic formula. Once we realize that Cummings is capable of this kind of thing, his utterances on related subjects naturally become "suspect." Ordinarily we should take for granted, if it is possible, the basic good will of an author. If we do so with the second poem, we may allow ourselves to brush aside the idea that the poem means just what, on a rapid first reading, it seems to mean: that all Jews are dangerous and phony. Instead, we might paraphrase it thus: "Evil-motivated men have taken the concept of the Jew (a factual term) and by adding certain emotional trimmings have turned it into the concept of the 'kike' (a hate-laden word). That is, they have associated the Jew with unproductive wealth and distorted morality and thus produced an imaginary monster." Now this interpretation is pleasanter and it may indeed be what Cummings intended. But we are not *quite* sure, because we are not sure that what he means by good will and what we mean by it are the same. The possibility remains that to him the fourth and fifth lines are obviously saying that what the Jew (a mere synonym for "kike") produces, exclusively, is "a few dead dollars and some twisted laws." Either way, we must be troubled by doubts concerning the poem's initial assumptions.

Whatever the final answer concerning this particular piece, though, it would take a different sort of mind from Cummings' to ridicule the defects of some of the groups he chooses to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

satirize without falling into Poundian quagmires (as he tends very clearly to do in his poem on FDR). Doubtless they have their complacencies, jargons, silly taboos, and worse, but Cummings is too fond of his eccentricity to take into account the justifiable sensitivity of other people to certain terms and concepts that have become political dynamite. War and Communism have little to fear, actually, from such a writer; but poems like the bit of whimsy beginning "one day a nigger" —with its key-pun on the word "shine" —do make their little contribution to the cause of human unhappiness. Not that Cummings sees it that way or that we hold with the current worldwide fashion of annihilating those we disagree with. After all, he is still our favorite tough sentimentalist and ponderer of love, sex and death. And he is still, in the main, the winning, undependable acrobat of American verse—and only secondarily the sometimes appalling victim of cultural attitudes which have distorted the work of several other brilliant poets of his generation.

Alfred Hayes's *Welcome to the Castle*, like his first published book, shows us the poet thinking aloud in a number of fairly transparent masks. Lacking Auden's razzle-dazzle and Fearing's fine rhythmic ear (though akin to these writers in some other ways), Hayes nevertheless controls his work through strong feeling and a good sense of the moral and narrative elements in dramatic monologue. The total effect is usually like that of his fiction; as a matter of fact, several of these pieces would make good short stories.

Much of the book is in the mood of Auden's "September 1, 1939"—very sad indeed. One gets no younger and the world's a wicked trap. But this is a little like Cummings' artificial gayety—oversimplified, certainly, but a way, too, of feeling things that means something important to most of us. The war poems have a realistic grasp of essentials that makes them seem inevitable. The sick-at-heart soldier about to sail for Europe on a ship seen off by a "charitable blonde in salvation blue," the degradation of Italian cities, the depressingly accurate study called "The Soldiers"—all focus our attention, as does the whole first part of the book, on the bleakness of historical truth. The other poems do this too, but they center more around the writer's sense of a failure to discover any real meaning or fulfillment in his own life—as judged, at any rate, by the perspectives of his radical and idealistic youth.

But though self-pity keeps intruding itself, the poems are moving because they do not depend on this feeling. There is a harsh irony in them, directed against the notion that anyone can be a truly free agent. This irony is most powerful when employed impersonally, as in "The Twenty Carabinieri of Mussolini" or—better—in the more compressed "The Bronx Express." The book is painful, honest and compassionate in a direct and simple way. Other things being equal, these are not at all bad qualities for a book of poems to have.

M. L. Rosenthal is a member of the English faculty of Washington Square College, New York University. He has contributed to Poetry, the University Review, New York Herald Tribune Books, and other publications.

LAW AND ETHICS

THE SENSE OF INJUSTICE, by Edmond N. Cahn (New York University Press; $3.50).

LIVING LAW OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY, by Jerome Hall (Bobbs-Merrill; $2.50).

REASON AND LAW, by Morris Raphael Cohen (The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill.; $3.50).

THE APPEARANCE within a short time of these three books is a striking reminder that current concern about values is particularly great among those who are interested in the law. Two of the authors, Cahn and Hall, are professors of law who have turned to philosophy for help in understanding the nature and functioning of law. They both attempt to present in very short compass a comprehensive review of law and values. The third book is a new collection of essays by the late Professor Morris R. Cohen, a distinguished philosopher who many years ago was attracted to the law because he saw in it a challenging testing ground for many of the recurrent problems of philosophy. It is a welcome supplement to *Law and the Social Order*, the notable volume which appeared in 1933.

The authors start, philosophically, from about the same place. All three believe in a valuating factor—they call it justice—which may be rationally invoked to measure the condition and course of a society and its legal institutions. But justice as they conceive it is not a detailed set of blueprints for society, nor a postulate from which equitable decisions may be deduced in particular situations, nor a book of formulas the key to which has been entrusted to any particular person or institution.

Their position, which unquestionably represents the prevailing view in American legal philosophy, is distinctly middle of the road. On the one hand, the authors' exploratory approach to values is far removed from the dogmatic form of natural law thinking, which still finds expression in professional journals. According to that view, if one believes in natural law the answer to every value question pertinent to the law is found by direct intuition or simple deduction. One who does not believe in this kind of natural law is considered to be totally without values and to recognize only the capricious, ungoverned will of whoever may be wielding power or of the transient majority.

On the other hand, in professing that values exist and that they can be known, the authors turn their backs upon rigorous positivism, which would ignore value as devoid of reality or beyond the domain of specifically legal inquiry. Such a view could make some appeal so long as it was generally assumed that judges were rigorously confined in the selection of the correct rule and its application to the particular case. But that assumption died in the twentieth century. As soon as it became apparent that judges had to make choices, as well in applying the common law as in interpreting statutes and constitutions, it became difficult to exclude from the serious study of the law all consideration of the bases for choice. An effective philosophy of law has to deal with values as long as judges, and legislators, must act as if there were such things.

"Justice" being the traditional symbol for the values significant for the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

law, what do these authors make of it? One of Cohen's major essays in the present collection, "Absolutisms in Law and Morals," outlines the approach:

> In the first place, we must not forget that our fundamental principles are after all only assumptions. . . . On the other hand we must have faith, courage, and persistence in our assumptions. . . . We may start with theories or opinions as to what is just, and by submitting them to the critical tests of logic or scientific method discriminate between their more and their less favorable elements. In this way we may not attain absolute truth, but we can make progress at least in the clarification of our ideas.

Professor Hall, after reviewing and rejecting positivist theories, finds validation for the idea of moral judgment in intuition reinforced by reflection, in coherence with wider experience, and in the coincidence of solutions among diverse cultures. He then shows how deeply values are involved in the functioning of law, particularly in a democratic state. Sociologists should be interested in his precise and subtle analysis of law as a cultural institution, although they may feel that law, as Hall defines it, takes in more than a proper share of society.

Professor Cahn, accepting the idea of justice as a basis for valuation, inquires how it functions and what are its manifestations. Using the sense of injustice as a starting point, he offers a plausible explanation of why ordinary men are interested in something as remote and static as justice. He describes the sense of injustice as the sympathetic reaction of shock and anger by which men respond to the fate of others, not merely with the passivity of compassion but with the vigor of self-defense. Tracing the operation of the sense of injustice by certain recurring manifestations, Cahn sets out to show that it has been and can continue to be an effective force in the law's functioning and growth. It points ultimately, he concludes, to a democratic legal order, fashioned by its subjects, resistant to social abuse and usurpation of power. The book is an eloquent affirmation of the ability of a working society to protect and cultivate the values which would generally be classed today as democratic and human.

Focusing on the sense of injustice, Cahn is able to drive home the important point, which Hall also emphasizes, that justice is not a set of fixed answers, but rather a guide in forming solutions to the endlessly different problems of society in movement. The book is rich in insights useful for those who are attempting to keep democratic values alive and growing in a rapidly changing world. Two criticisms might be suggested. One is that the development of the ideas is occasionally obscured by rhetorical elaboration and sustained flights of simile. Another is that some uncertainty remains as to whether the values discussed and applied are merely being assumed or whether an attempt is being made to demonstrate their rightness. If the latter, the attempt is not too successful. Cahn does not face squarely enough the fact that both the events which produce the crucial empathetic reaction and the value propositions which arise from the experience are necessarily conditioned not only by the cultural heritage of the observers but also by their group attitudes and personal histories.

If this latter criticism is justified, it suggests only that Professor Cahn might address himself further to the vindication of the basic values he embraces. In the present state of global conflict over ultimate values, it is hardly enough to assume the democratic ideal. If it can be rationally defended, as Professor Cohen thought, it should be, not merely by pointing to moral intuition and juridical experience, but by rigorously mustering the full resources of the social sciences and ethics. JACOB D. HYMAN

Jacob D. Hyman is professor of Law at the University of Buffalo Law School. He practised law in New York City and with the government in Washington.

OLD AGE OF A HERO

ACROSS THE RIVER AND INTO THE TREES, by Ernest Hemingway (Scribner's; $3).

AFTER A WEEKEND LEAVE in Venice, Richard Cantwell dies in the back seat of his car. He was a career soldier, a general in World War II, a colonel in the postwar infantry, and as he dies he quotes the dying Stonewall Jackson: "No, no, let us cross over the river and rest under the shade of the trees." Hemingway takes from this both the title and tone of his new novel. It is a slight, sad book, quieter and more muted than his others, a brooding twilight picture brushed by autumnal mists.

Inevitably, Colonel Cantwell is again the Hemingway Hero—Jake Barnes, Frederick Henry, Robert Jordan. His toughness, too, is tinged with a hard-surfaced sentimentality and his pride and control cracked by little, explosive bursts of irascibility. Like his younger selves, the Colonel has a system of morality which is almost exclusively esthetic, the struggle to keep his integrity in a shapeless world which slops its bilge over a man and rips him with its sharp, meaningless brutalities. To keep clean and untouched, he must move with intense and delicate awareness in the mold he has designed for himself—the ideal self-portrait of the romantic hero, extravagant and brave, well-loved but alone, the passionate and disdainful hidalgo, exquisitely sensitive and gracefully cruel, a careful and devout hunter and lover. He is a man whose gaze is often inward, rarely thinking, but watchful for flaws in the perfection of his own identity.

But Barnes-Henry-Jordan has grown older and is about to die, and while he had in his youth consorted with death as friend and enemy, he now lies in her lap, still gallant, but mellowed and more gentle. He is no longer proud of his irritability and hardness; he is now rather abashed by it and tries to control it. He looks at the misfortunes of others with more sympathy; blood and brutality no longer attract him and are reduced to being merely the evils of his work as a soldier.

Across the River and Into the Trees is not much more, in structure, than a long love scene and a farewell, an account of the last weekend which the Colonel spends with the girl he loves. This nineteen-year-old Venetian countess is the classic Hemingway heroine, beautiful and honest and courageous, impossibly perfect and pure for the uses of long, calm years, but made probable by the doomed ambience in which she moves, with time tearing at her and love too short-lived to tolerate anything but perfection. Cantwell not only loves her, but uses her as King David did the little Shunammite, to take warmth from her youth for his brittle bones. That is probably why he so enjoys calling her "daughter."

The aging soldier and the girl day-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dream, exchange gifts, shop, and make love in a gondola. He talks colorfully and with some wit about his war career, they eat and drink and try to play, but with them always is the bitter recognition and fevered avoidance of the known end. Toward the close of his leave, he goes duck-hunting without her, acquits himself well by his own rigid standards of sportsmanship, and dies on the way back to Trieste.

In the background of this tragic song inimical winds blow out of the gray Venetian sky, and one hears the gently ironic, kind and weary voices of the gondoliers, the waiters and the market women of Venice. And over these Venetians lies a shadow of dissolution, symbolized by Cantwell's imminent death which is also each man's death and the decay of his civilization.

Hemingway invests his writing with the same esthetic care and discipline that Cantwell brings to acting out his life and death. The minor characters spring to life with sure, spare strokes and are maintained unerringly clear and separate. The artful, rhythmic sentences with their compelling stresses, the words that bear many echoes and undertones, the phrases that quiver with emotion, blur the border between prose and poetry. The one major love scene is almost erotic yet restrained and delicate and quite beautiful, as is the bittersweet farewell. Here and there the high art lapses and one finds the usual Hemingway flaws—the useless obscenities and the spots of repetition which serve no artistic purpose—and always irritating is the firm rejection of cerebration so characteristic of Hemingway people.

It is quite possible that many readers will miss in this novel the bright color and the restless excitement of the earlier ones, but although the canvas is now smaller and painted in grayed tones, there is no less art. The mixture is, on a minor scale, as before and still magical; the Hemingway spell still holds.

KATE SIMON

BRIEF COMMENT

Primer of the Novel, by Vincent McHugh (Random House; $2.50).

This book is addressed, the author explains in a foreword, to the apprentice novelist and the student in intermediate or advanced writing courses. They should be interested to learn the correct way to prepare a manuscript for submission, the necessity of making a carbon copy, a list of good reference books, the advantages of joining the Authors Guild, and what to expect of an agent, a publisher and the reviewers. They and the "working novelist" and that "rare and shining novel-reader who is concerned with . . . what the novelist does and how he sets out to do it"—who McHugh hopes will also be tempted to look into these pages—should be stimulated by many of the observations on narrative, characterization, theme, approach and the novelist's relation to society.

But almost anyone who reads the book will at the same time be irritated by a number of the heavy-handed definitions and axioms. These range from the obvious ("A novel is a world in itself") to the arbitrary ("There is no such thing as fact in a novel") to the smart-alecky ("A publisher is just like anybody else, only smarter"); and they tend to detract from what is valuable and entertaining. Since McHugh is himself a novelist, one wishes that he had been more openly personal when discussing so highly personal a field as novel-writing.

ANNE L. GOODMAN

THEATRE: Wilson and Pirandello

ONCE AGAIN it has become true that to see the most interesting theatre one must leave the conspicuous show places and seek it out in country spots and odd corners of the city. The Brattle Theatre in Cambridge, Massachusetts—a theatre that presents generally superior plays throughout the year—has recently given Edmund Wilson's "The Little Blue Light," while "Barefoot in Canossa," a new adaptation of Pirandello's "Henry IV," was done as a tryout in the summer theatre at Seacliff, Long Island, and Studio 7, a tenant of the old Provincetown Playhouse in Macdougal Street, is now showing Pirandello's "Naked."

Perhaps it is speaking a bit loosely to refer to these events as good theatre, since the conditions under which plays

HOW TO BE WELL-INFORMED ON BRITISH AFFAIRS

You can't understand the world today without knowing what Britain is doing, thinking and planning. To know what's really happening in England, read the world-famous *Manchester Guardian*. Mail the coupon below for a 4-week trial subscription, at our risk.

If you like frank speaking and honest thinking on British and world affairs—even when it's the unpopular view—you'll like the *Guardian*, "English liberalism's bravest voice." (*Time Mag.*) This free-examination offer brings you the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, airmail edition, which summarizes the news and carries the week's outstanding editorials and articles. Features include foreign correspondence by Alistair Cooke in the United States, and others, financial news, book reviews, literary articles, etc.

MONEY BACK GUARANTEE! To accept our Free Examination Offer, mail the coupon with your payment today. If not delighted after reading four issues, write us and we'll return your money in full. 53 E. 51 St., N. Y. 22.

FREE Examination OFFER!

THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN, 53 E. 51 St., N. Y. 22.
Send me the *Manchester Guardian Weekly*, as checked below. My payment is enclosed. If not satisfied after seeing four issues, I may get a full refund on request, and the trial will have cost me nothing.

☐ 1 yr. $6.50 ☐ 20 week trial, $2

Name_____
Address_____
City_____ Zone____ State_____ R-1

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are presented in the off-Broadway playhouses do not permit adequate preparation, so that what we get are usually rough laboratory sketches rather than actual productions. Yet I cannot deny that I found myself more absorbed at most of these out-of-the-way "experiments" than I have been for a long time at the more consecrated amusement centers. The reason for this is not simply that the plays I have mentioned are more substantial than ordinary theatre fare, but that they aim at quite different ends. Most plays today are designed as better or worse *jobs*. In the sense that a play, aside from its being an instrument for entertainment, may also be viewed as the expression of what an interesting or representative person has to say, most of the plays we see hardly exist at all.

The fascination of such a play as Wilson's "The Little Blue Light" lies not so much in its literary or dramatic qualities *per se*—a subject which may be left to the time of its New York production—but in the fact that it reflects what a sensitive, thoughtful, aware person of our day thinks and feels about the world. That such a person may seem to stammer and give other evidence of awkwardness, that he may be prolix and not always cogent, is of minor importance at the moment compared to the *novelty* of hearing him speak from his true self—a self that, while distinctly individual, is nevertheless part of our general consciousness. To discover a face, a man, a recognizably relevant and intimate human thought in the theatre —what greater pleasure can the theatre today offer, where, as practically everywhere else, we usually find only depersonalized articles for sale?

The period after the First World War revealed a growing crisis in our conception of the human personality. The individual no longer seemed to be One. Neither we nor our behavior seemed to form a truly unified body with a clear and steady identity. A man was a series of loosely assembled "aspects"—so that he no longer seemed, even to himself, to belong to himself. The self had become split into an almost endless series of splinterselves, no longer representative of what he might think of as "I." The age-old sense of human loneliness had been strangely multiplied. Not only did man feel separated from his fellows; he also felt that all his little selves were separated from one another and from what he once thought of as himself. He was lost in a crowd of various and dissimilar "I's."

Pirandello dramatized this alienation of the self from itself in numerous variations, and through them evolved what amounted to a new dramatic technique, together with a new manner. The technique consisted of an agonized exposition of extraordinary complexity and illusiveness used as the basis of plot, because the very difficulty of explaining the plot is Pirandello's method of expressing the difficulty of determining the truth of any given situation or character. The Pirandello manner is a combination of emotional hysteria, insanely passionate ratiocination, grimacing irony and a kind of geometrical theatricality, part shriek of pain, part Italian farce. The content sometimes becomes as static and invariable as a tic, the manner as automatic and rigid as an affectation. But even when he exasperates, Pirandello is a compelling dramatic phenomenon.

The anguish in Wilson's "The Little Blue Light" is typical of the Second World War's aftermath. It is no longer the terror of the self's dissolution that is being dramatized, but the sense that the self has almost no right to exist and the fear that man—whatever he may be —is being crowded out, denied, done away with and destroyed altogether, not only as a fact but as an idea.

Pirandello suggests that man achieves unity only as the artist sees him; Wilson suggests that man will soon have no opportunity even to ask himself the questions Pirandello poses. Pirandello reflects that older civilization wherein the self, once whole, began to disintegrate; Wilson foreshadows a new civilization where the self has become obsolete before it has had a chance to form. Pirandello's plays are still related to tragedy; Wilson's comedy is a nightmare. In trying to embody the frightfulness of this nightmare—in a strangely measured and urbane tone that adds to the force of our shudder—Wilson actually brings to the theatre the relief and pleasure of allowing us to hear the voice of our disquiet—in itself more consoling as well as more eloquent than the horribly smooth gabble of the amusers.

HAROLD CLURMAN

MUSIC: Incidents and Altercations

JOSEF KRIPS, Vienna State Opera conductor, arrived from Europe in mid-July, accompanied by his wife, to fill a week's engagement as guest conductor of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra at the Ravinia Festival. He carried a visa, in good order, granted him by the US State Department in Vienna.

At Ellis Island he was halted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Though no charge against him was made public, he was told to choose either to return to Europe immediately "of his own free will" or to remain in detention while the Immigration Service undertook an investigation. He chose the course of "free will"; the other would have been pointless and unrealistic. He had only a week's work in the United States, scheduled to begin in a few days, and he was under contract to conduct in Salzburg and elsewhere in Europe as soon as his Ravinia concerts were over. So he held his tongue and went back, leaving the valedictory remarks to his wife, who observed with spirit that her husband had been a welcome and fêted visitor in every other country he had visited since the end of the war.

Apparently Krips had visited one country too many. He had conducted extensively in Russia—under arrangements made, he maintained, at the suggestion of the Austrian government. Whether the Immigration Service is inclined to suspect anyone who has set foot on Russian soil is a matter for conjecture, since its officials have steadfastly declined to explain their action. No fascist stains appear to mar Krips's wartime record; moreover, the Immigration Service has not hesitated in the past two years (except in the case of Walter Gieseking in 1949) to admit musicians who may reasonably be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suspected of having harbored strong fascist or collaborationist sympathies.

Whatever the reason for considering Krips a poor security risk, the abrupt and secretive action of the Immigration Service will cause a further deterioration of international artistic relations. Europeans—regardless of their political sympathies—cannot understand the bureaucratic discourtesy of a divided authority under which the State Department encourages such celebrated artists as Gieseking and Krips to travel as far as Ellis Island, only to be snubbed by the Immigration Service. If we had not humiliated a man whose musicianship—if not his politics—commands universal admiration, our firmness in the Gieseking case might have won approval in many European quarters. Our treatment of Krips, however, is another matter altogether. It amounts to an international scandal, for he has a good name in all Western Europe; an artist and a gentleman, he at least deserves to hear the reason why the door was slammed in his face. So do the American people, unless we prefer to have the roster of our visiting musicians selected arbitrarily by the head of the Immigration Service.

The affaire Krips was not the only enlivening altercation of the summer. Up in Tanglewood, Serge Koussevitzky spent two months waging internecine warfare against the trustees of the Boston Symphony. This struggle of strong wills, which led Koussevitzky to insist that he should no longer be identified as "music director" on the Tanglewood programs and which was still in progress when the Berkshire Festival ended in August, was touched off by the trustees' engagement—without Koussevitzky's approval or knowledge—of the Italian conductor Victor De Sabata to direct two concerts in the Music Shed. In a radio interview with James Fassett on a CBS Green Room program, Koussevitzky objected to the hiring of De Sabata, on the ground that the Berkshire Festival, conceived as an American institution, has in the past limited its list of guest conductors to Americans. (Koussevitzky's pupil, Eleazar de Carvalho, who has conducted there several times, is a Brazilian.)

Everyone understood—since gossip flies freer at Tanglewood than in any other musical square mile on earth—that Koussevitzky was employing double talk. His real objection was not to De Sabata or his nationality; in the course of time he issued a public statement of apology and reconciliation, though he did not attend De Sabata's concerts. He was disturbed and angry because he had been left out of an important decision about the festival programs. The real issue was unmistakable: Who was to determine the artistic policies of the Berkshire Festival, Koussevitzky or the Boston trustees?

The dispute brought the question of Tanglewood's future character into the open. De Sabata's two appearances fell outside the customary serious context of the festival. He played glorified pop-concert programs in spread-eagle fashion, beaming at the enthusiasm of the audience and milking it for applause with an adroitness rarely encountered since the death of the Keith-Orpheum vaudeville circuit. He drew the summer's second largest audience; Koussevitzky surpassed him only on the closing day.

For the first time, Tanglewood was embroiled in a major conflict of ideologies. Whatever his foibles and weaknesses, Koussevitzky is a lofty and dedicated musician, and his best performances, like that of Bach's Mass in B minor in August, are seldom matched in genuine sublimity. De Sabata, on the evidence of his first season in the United States, is a skilled crafsman but a confirmed believer in appealing to the lowest common denominator of public appreciation.

If the board's choice of De Sabata typifies its aspirations, the days of the Berkshire Festival's artistic leadership in American summer music are numbered. Tanglewood was not conceived as a forum for rabble-rousers. Koussevitzky will not let it become one if he has his way. But the final decision rests with the trustees, for they and not Koussevitzky control the policies of the orchestra. Uniquely among summer musical enterprises, Tanglewood has resisted commercialism. Will it now become another Hollywood Bowl?

CECIL SMITH

WINDY HILL
ON ORANGE LAKE
A pleasantly informal vacation in friendly atmosphere. Books, records, ping-pong, a two-mile lake for boating, fishing, swimming. Food of excellent quality in generous quantity. Rates: $40 weekly, $8 daily.
65 miles from New York City
JANE C. ARENZ R.D. No. 1 Walden, N. Y.
Phone: Newburgh 115-W-2

MAMANASCO Lake Lodge
Ridgefield, Conn. • Phone 820
A beautiful country estate converted into a vacation paradise for adults. Magnificent private lake. All seasonal sports. Varied indoor activities. Television. Superb accommodations and cuisine. Weekly rates $50 up; daily $10 up.

DEBATE

PUBLIC DEBATE:
"Is Yugoslavia on the Road to Socialist Democracy?"
"Yes!" says **O. John Rogge**, former Assistant U. S. Atty.-Gen., NY Counsel to Yugoslav Permanent UN Mission
"No!" says ***Hal Draper***, editor of Labor Action
Friday, September 22, 8 P.M. at
Manhattan Plaza • 66 East 4 Street
Auspices: Independent Socialist League
Admission: 75¢ (tax included)

ASSIGNMENTS

COLUMBIA, M.A., will accept free-lance assignments, writing, editing, research, proofreading, publicity. Experienced. Telephone: OR 3-6126.

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS. 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

FOR SALE

COMPACT, CONVENIENT HOME IN SUBURBS: 35 minutes from Grand Central; in an acre of tall trees overlooking lake a 14-room Colonial, 7 bedrooms, 3 baths, lavatory, sundeck, garden, 2-car garage, outdoor picnic area; with a dozen pink and white dogwood trees a glory in spring; less than 10 minutes walk to station, less than 10 to fine public school. Occupancy: October 1; $25,000. Terms. Angell, Scarsdale 3-0300.

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 861, Radio City, New York.

LITERARY SERVICE

WRITERS—Efficient sales service for your books, short stories, articles, plays. Free booklet. Write today! Daniel S. Mead Literary Agency, 419 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

PECANS

WE ARE NOW HARVESTING jumbo, delicious, thin-shelled PECANS; ideal for gifts. Will ship prepaid (Cont. U.S.) 5 lbs. $3.25, 10 lbs. $5.50, 100 lbs. or more, F.O.B. 42¢ per lb. FABIS FARM, Brownwood, Texas.

Classified Rates
•
Per word, once 12¢
Per word 6 times 11¢
Per word 13 times 10¢
•
NEW REPUBLIC

Printed by STEINBERG PRESS, INC., Morgan & Johnson Aves., Brooklyn 6, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Special Combination Offer

New Republic
52 issues
(regularly $6.50)

Harper's Magazine
12 issues
(regularly $5.00)

BOTH for only $8.50

Value $11.50

Two distinguished magazines, a weekly and a monthly, for little more than the price of one!

The *New Republic*, each week, appeals to citizens eager to keep abreast of significant news, to learn what's behind it, and what the future holds—social, economic, political. Independent, courageous, engagingly written by the foremost liberal journalists and thinkers.

Harper's Magazine is a general monthly famous for authoritative analysis and interpretation of contemporary affairs—political, social, and cultural—with first-rate fiction, verse and criticism.

Now you may subscribe to both at the low rate of only $8.50, provided they are ordered at the same time and payment is sent with your order. Subscriptions may be new or renewal and may be mailed to separate addresses. Foreign postage $2.50 extra, Canadian postage, $1.

NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

Please enter this magazine order:
One year of the *New Republic* and *Harper's Magazine* for $8.50, for which I enclose payment. (Foreign and Canadian Postage Extra.)

NAME_____

ADDRESS_____

_____

9/18/50

Order Today—

while this low combination rate is in effect! We cannot guarantee this price after September 30.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED